

REMARKS

Claims 1 – 7, 11 – 21 are pending in the application.

With regard to the objection to the drawings, claims 8 – 10 have been cancelled, thereby obviating a need for proposed drawing changes.

With regard to the incorporation of essential material comment in paragraph 2 of the Office Action, Applicants presume that the Examiner is referring to the paragraph on page 13 of the instant application. Applicants would like to point out that this reference is merely to the priority application upon which the present application is based. A similar statement is made in all applications filed by the undersigned. The priority document is incorporated by reference in the event that an inadvertent translation error is made. It is therefore respectfully requested that the objection to this sentence be withdrawn. However, should the Examiner continue to object to the statement, Applicants would be willing to delete the subject sentence.

In order to address the Examiner's various rejections of the claims, independent claim 1 has been amended to indicate that the main body 4 and the blade sections 6 are made of metal; support for this added language can be found, for example, on page 3, line 8, and on page 13, line 8, of the specification of the instant application. In addition, amended claim 1 incorporates original claim 17 therein; thus, amended claim 1 now additionally provides that the radially outer edges 22 of the blade sections 6 are embodied as additional cutting edges 8.

Furthermore, a new claim 20 has been added that provides that the bead-like embossments 9 of the blade sections 6 merge into the circular disk-shaped embossment 27, wherein the embossments 9 and 27 have a uniform and constant height. Support for this new claim can be found, for example, in Fig. 3 and on page 12, lines 9 – 13.

A new claim 21 has also been added, and is similar to amended claim 1 but is a combination of claims 1 and 18, and refers to the radially inner edges 20.

The Examiner has rejected claim 1 as being anticipated by Freedlander. Applicants respectfully submit that such a rejection is not justified. In particular, Freedlander discloses a flexible elastomeric safety lawn mower blade for a lawn mower. In particular, Freedlander relates to a blade 15 having a main body and a central mounting aperture 26. Formed on the main body or central portion 21 are arms 22 and 23 that extend approximately radially therefrom. Edge portions 24 and 25 on the arms provide cutting edges. Depressed sections 29, or ridges 31, are disposed in or on the arms.

In contrast to Freedlander, the metal cutting blade of amended claim 1 provides, instead of the depressed sections or ridges of Freedlander, bead-like embossments 9 in the blade sections 6. It is respectfully submitted that this is a very critical difference since on the one hand it would not even be possible to provide bead-like embossments in the flexible, plastic material of Freedlander. It should be noted that it is critical to Freedlander to make the blade of plastic in order to provide a flexible elastomeric safety lawn blade that will be flexible enough to minimize injury when striking a shoe, human limb, or similar object (see, for example, the abstract in column 1 of Freedlander).

With regard to the features of original claim 17, which are now incorporated into amended claim 1, and according to which the radially outer edges 22 of the blade sections 6 are embodied as additional cutting edges 8, it is respectfully submitted that such features would not even be possible with Freedlander, since in this reference only a single edge is provided, and hence only a single cutting edge on a respective one of the arms 22 and 23. It is furthermore respectfully submitted that additional edges with additional cutting edges are precluded for the Freedlander blade for technical reasons,

and there is furthermore certainly no teaching and also no suggestion for the provision of outer edges having additional cutting edges. The same is true for new independent claim 21, which is a combination of original claims 1 and 18, wherein radially inner edges 20, rather than the radially outer edges 22, of the blade section 6 are embodied as additional cutting edges 8. It is respectfully submitted that claims 1 and 21 are patentable over the Freedlander reference since, pursuant to MPEP sections 2131 (last paragraph) and 2143.03 (first paragraph) the cited reference does not teach or suggest all of the claim limitations.

The Examiner has also rejected, among others, claim 1 as being anticipated by Andersson. Since original claim 17 has been incorporated into claim 1, it is respectfully submitted that already for this reason amended claim 1 is patentable over the Andersson reference. In addition, it should be noted that in contrast to the knife portion proper 6 with its cutting edge 7 of Andersson, claim 1 of the instant application already requires that the blade sections 6 have edges 7 that extend in a radial direction and form cutting edges 8.

With regard to new claim 20, this aspect of the present invention relates to the height 26 of the embossments (see Fig. 3a), and as can be seen in particular in Fig. 3 provides that the bead-like embossments 9 of the blade section 6 merge into the circular disk-shaped embossment 27, with the embossments then having a uniform and constant height. This is a significant feature in that it provides for the formation of a clamping plane by means of which the cutting blade of the present invention receives a more suitable abutment against a clamping plane than is provided for with the cited art. For example, in Freedlander in the comparable region there must be provided additional metallic plates on both sides of the cutting blade in order to even provide the rigidity required in the clamping region.

With regard to the remaining dependent claims, it is respectfully submitted that in view of the amendment to claim 1, along with new claim 21, and the patentability thereof as discussed above, these dependent claims should also be allowable.

In view of the foregoing discussion, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration of the allowability of the pending claims of the instant application. Should the Examiner have any further comments or suggestions, the undersigned would very much welcome a telephone call in order to discuss any outstanding issues and to expedite placement of the application into condition for allowance.

Respectfully submitted,



Robert W. Becker, Reg. No. 26,255
for applicant(s)

ROBERT W. BECKER & ASSOCIATES
707 Highway 66 East, Suite B
Tijeras, NM 87059

Telephone: (505) 286-3511
Facsimile: (505) 286-3524

RWB:mac